

"crime trust" bunk to keep the public mind, and the regular grand jury's activities, off any investigation of alleged frauds in the election of a state's attorney.

Then the Republican, Socialist and Progressive candidates who ran for state's attorney against Hoyne last year applied to Judge Cooper for a special grand jury and special state's attorney to investigate charges of fraud in the election.

Knowing that this application was before Judge Cooper, Hoyne hurried before Judge Kersten and made application for a special grand jury, although he had bitterly opposed any special grand jury before, and said no special state's attorney would be appointed if he could prevent it.

However, he got Judge Kersten to grant a special grand jury, and to appoint a personal friend of Hoyne, Clyde L. Day, special state's attorney.

Rinaker, Cunnea and Haight insisted on the appointment of a special grand jury and state's attorney by Judge Cooper, and evidently did not want to testify before Judge Kersten's special grand jury.

Judge Cooper then decided to grant a special grand jury and a special state's attorney. And there the matter stands.

In the meantime it is up to the county board to decide which special grand jury and state's attorney it will grant money for the expense of the investigation; and as the county board is anti-Hearst, indications are it will ignore Hoyne's pal, Day, and recognize as official the jury and state's attorney to be appointed by Judge Cooper.

In the meantime Hoyne and the Hearst papers are attacking Judge Cooper and charging that the "crime" and traction trusts are behind the movement to oust Hoyne from office. And Judge Cooper said from the bench that Hoyne tricked Judge Kersten.

And the Hearst papers are egging

Judge Kersten on to stand pat and fight Judge Cooper, while the other papers are backing Judge Cooper up.

So we have the prospect of two special grand juries, directed by two special prosecutors—one investigating the election in sympathy with Hoyne and the other not yet named, but presumably to be satisfactory to the three candidates who ran against Hoyne.

It is said that Judge Cooper belongs to the anti-Hearst Democratic faction and that Judge Kersten is friendly to the Hearst faction, although that ought to have nothing whatever to do with an honest investigation.

I don't care a tinkers dam for either of these factions or any other political faction, and I can't see where the other trust newspapers are any less selfish and partisan than the Hearst papers, but up to date it looks to me as if Judge Cooper has the best of the argument, from the point of view of the people of Chicago.

For after all the real question is who was really elected by the voters last fall, and whether the votes were counted as the voters cast them.

If Hoyne was honestly elected, I can't see why he objects to an investigation of the charges by an impartial grand jury and state's attorney.

He hasn't strengthened his case by insisting that he conduct the investigation of his own election, either personally or through a special state's attorney picked by him. Hoyne may be entirely honest and sincere, but his frantic efforts to control the investigation into his own election are very apt to make people generally believe that there ought to be a thorough investigation by an impartial grand jury and state's attorney who could not be controlled by any political faction.

If Judge Cooper appoints as special attorney a lawyer of known integrity and political independence, and a special grand jury of fair-minded